

The disingenuousness of this reaches a new level of misrepresentation to the American taxpayer as to what the burden is that is going to be put on them as a result of this proposal. Now, why do they do this? Why do they deny there is \$40 billion of spending, which they know is going to occur, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle absolutely know is going to occur? Why do they deny it is going to happen? Why do they use this gimmick where they claim we are going back to a cost of a program which is less than it is today after we put a cost on the books that is three times what it is today? Because they want to avoid something called pay-go—pay-go—which is their representation of how they discipline the Federal budget.

Every time you listen to a colleague from the other side of the aisle talk about disciplining the Federal budget, you will hear those words: I am for pay-go; I am for pay-go. We hear it from the budget chairman incessantly. We hear it from other members of the other side of the aisle. Pay-go is the way we will discipline the Federal budget.

Well, let's see what they have done to pay-go since they have been in charge of the Congress. There is no more pay-go. It should be fraud-go. It is actually Swiss cheese-go since this Congress has been dominated by the Democratic Party.

I will bet you that everybody who ran for election from the Democratic side of the aisle to this Congress said they were going to discipline the Federal deficit using pay-go. Since they have been in office, since they have been running this Congress, they have either waived or gotten around pay-go on about 12 different occasions, representing billions of dollars of cost to the American taxpayer, of which this \$40 billion item we are doing today is one of the biggest. With minimum wage, they went around pay-go; with the Water Resources Development Act, they went around pay-go; with PDUFA, they went around pay-go; with immigration reform, they went around pay-go; with the Energy bill, they went around pay-go; with the MILC bill, they went around pay-go; with the county payments or payments in lieu of taxes, at \$4 billion, they went around pay-go; with the new mandatory Pell grants, \$6 billion, they went around pay-go; and now here, with SCHIP, they are going around pay-go to the tune of \$40 billion. Almost \$90 billion has been proposed to be spent by the other side of the aisle since they took control of this Congress which should have been subject to pay-go but where they have either waived, ignored, or gimmicked pay-go out of existence. So where is the fiscal discipline? It doesn't exist. It doesn't exist.

The only thing they intend to use pay-go for is to force taxes to go up on American workers. They will use it for that, there is no question about that.

When we get to the point where some of these tax issues are raised by expiring, they will say pay-go applies to that and we have to pay for that, so taxes will go up on the American workers and on the American economy. But when it comes to spending money, there is no discipline of pay-go from the other side of the aisle.

Anyone who stands on the other side of the aisle and claims that pay-go is a viable vehicle for disciplining the Federal deficit, well, the next thing they are going to tell you is they have a bridge to sell you in Brooklyn or that the check is in the mail.

The simple fact is, it is a fraud on the American taxpayer when that statement is made. This bill pretty much completes the thought that there is no more pay-go.

Then, on top of that—they are not comfortable enough in this bill to spend \$40 billion and claim they are not spending it, which is exactly what they do in the second 5 years—that is not enough for the other side of the aisle. In the House, they put in language repealing one of the most important enforcement mechanisms to discipline the cost of Medicare, which is, if for 2 years the payment for the cost of Medicare from the general fund exceeds 45 percent of the overall cost of Medicare—as we all know Medicare is supposed to be an insurance program that is paid for by the HI insurance, but it also gets support by the general fund—if that cost exceeds 45 percent for 2 years in a row, then we, as a Congress, are supposed to take another look and say that is not the way Medicare is supposed to be funded. It is supposed to be funded through the HI insurance. We go back to look at disciplining Medicare spending and making it more affordable.

No. Not any longer. The House of Representatives not only spends \$40 billion they claim they are not spending and don't pay for, they also, in their bill, repeal the 45-percent rule, one of the few disciplines around here which allows this body to stand up and say we are profligate. Let's get this under control.

I think the American consumer needs to know that they get what they pay for. In the last election they got a Congress which has a philosophical viewpoint which has not changed a whole lot in the last 50 years. I was here the last time Congress was dominated by the Democratic Party. I was here when Tip O'Neil ran the House of Representatives. Wow, did we spend money back then. Let me tell you, we are back to that style of governance. Only this time it is being done with the representation that there is discipline because we are using pay-go. Unfortunately, however, pay-go doesn't exist when it comes to spending. It is "fraud-go," it is "Swiss cheese-go," and the American people get stuck with the bill.

Our children and our children's children get stuck with the bill because, in order to address certain political con-

stituencies, the other side of the aisle believes it needs to spend the money, and it does not have the courage to stand up for its own rules, the rules they put forward.

I have always said pay-go was a fraud, but the other side of the aisle marches behind that banner in budget after budget, claiming that pay-go gives us fiscal discipline. Here is \$90 billion of spending in just 6 months. They have only been in charge for 6 months—\$90 billion. That is a lot of money in 6 months that should have been subject to pay-go, which has been gamed, ignored, or claimed an emergency so that pay-go would not apply.

As a practical matter, let's have no more talk of pay-go in this body. Let's talk about what we are really doing on this SCHIP bill. We are going to spend \$40 billion, and we do not pay for it. That is just in the next 5 years. If you extrapolated this, it actually works out to be somewhere in the \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion range over the life expectancy of the program, the 75-year life expectancy, which is the way we calculate things around here that deal with entitlements.

This is not fiscally responsible, and it is clear, if we continue down this path, we are going to set up a train wreck for those who come after us and have to pay the costs of this type of profligate spending which has no discipline attached to it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the Republican side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. About 1 minute.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to preserve that minute, and if one of the Republican Senators wishes, they be given that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I speak now in the 30 minutes I understand is reserved for the majority in morning business.

GENOCIDE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is a day which can be historic. Important items will be discussed on the floor of the Senate, including health insurance for literally millions of American kids. At the same time, there is a debate that has been started in New York at the United Nations Security Council. It is a debate about a genocide.

It is, thank goodness, rare that we have to address the issue of genocide in this world, but today we must. We are talking of a genocide today, in New York, at the Security Council, that has caused untold human misery, mass murder, dislocation, torture, rape, and the torching of entire villages. For 4 years the world has watched this tragedy. That's right, for 4 years.

Haven't we learned our lesson when it comes to letting genocide continue without taking action?

There is a great Senate story involving former Wisconsin Senator Bill Proxmire. In 1967, Senator Proxmire began a streak in the Senate that has never been broken. Mr. President, 18 years earlier, in 1949, President Truman had sent the United Nations Genocide Convention to the Senate for advice and consent. In 1967, it was still languishing, held up by a small band of Senators who opposed it. Many Senators just shook their head because of this opposition. Bill Proxmire rose to his feet.

Starting in 1967, Senator Proxmire made a speech every day the Senate was in session, for 19 years, imploring the Senate to adopt the Genocide Convention. All together, he gave 3,211 speeches—each one of them different. In 1986 the Senate gave its consent to the treaty.

Why did Senator Proxmire continue to give all those speeches, day after day, year after year? It wasn't just stubbornness. It was a moral obligation, and because he understood genocide was happening again. At that time it was happening in Cambodia.

Between 1975 and 1979 the Khmer Rouge murdered 2 million people. The United States wisely and bravely led the international effort to hold the Nazi co-conspirators to account at Nuremberg. We and the rest of the world failed to act while Cambodia was being turned into killing fields.

In 1994 we failed to act again when between 800,000 and 1 million people were murdered in Rwanda in 1 month.

Sadly, we have failed to take the necessary action to stop the genocide in Darfur. More than 2½ years have passed since the U.N. commission of inquiry concluded that:

Crimes against humanity and war crimes have been committed in Darfur and may be no less serious and heinous than genocide.

Earlier this year, President Bush declared:

For too long, the people of Darfur have suffered at the hands of a government that is complicit in the bombing, murder and rape of innocent civilians. My administration has called these actions by their rightful name: genocide. The world has a responsibility to put an end to it.

Yesterday, the new British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, said in a joint press conference with President Bush that:

Darfur is the greatest humanitarian crisis the world faces today.

Yet it is not simply enough to acknowledge genocide. We need to follow

Senator Proxmire's example in having the courage, in real time, to act against it.

The crisis in Darfur has been repeated over and over. Paul Salopek, a Chicago Tribune reporter, was captured and jailed by the Khartoum government for 34 days last year. He wrote a haunting description of what one sees when you fly over the villages of Darfur. This is what he wrote:

Their torched huts seen from the air, look like cigarette burns on a torture victim's skin.

Most recently, Refugees International released a report documenting that:

Rape on a mass scale is one of the hallmarks of the conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan. An estimated 300,000 people in Darfur have been killed during this genocide; 300,000 people in a country of 40 million. In the United States that would be the equivalent of over 2 million people killed.

Incredibly, the Sudanese Government claims the atrocities are part of their war on terror. At a press conference in Washington earlier this summer, Sudan's Ambassador to the United States compared the slaughter to a family quarrel, and he said:

Just you and your cousin fighting with you.

Just this last week, Sudanese President Bashir visited Darfur and said:

Most of Darfur is now secure and enjoying real peace.

People there are "living normal lives."

These are lies. This is genocide. It is calculated. It is happening on our watch, in our time.

This week, the global community has a chance to finally make a difference. I am going to join today with Senators FEINGOLD and MENENDEZ in calling for a decisive vote at the United Nations on an expanded peacekeeping force and renewed diplomatic effort in Darfur. The U.N. Security Council will vote this week, maybe even today, on a new United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force that can make a dramatic difference in stemming the violence in Darfur. It also provides an equally important opportunity for peace negotiations.

After years of duplicity in the genocide, Sudanese President Bashir agreed last month to the significant expanded joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force. Yet a series of his recent comments contradict that commitment, and a history of involvement in violence makes immediate action all the more important.

The need is simple—rapid deployment of the new peacekeeping force and a renewed diplomatic effort at a long-term political settlement.

I have tried in some small way to urge the members of the United Nations Security Council to act swiftly. I discussed urgency of these matters with U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon and the Ambassadors of China, Ghana, Republic of Congo, Russia, and South Africa. All were current or per-

manent members of the Security Council. It is the first time I have ever picked up the phone to call Ambassadors from other countries about a vote in the United Nations Security Council, but I think it is that important. It is my hope that our U.N. Ambassador, Zalmay Khalilzad, will work closely with these nations and Secretary General Ban to make these steps a reality.

I stressed to the Secretary General and to the Ambassadors that the Security Council should be firm in its mandate. We need a force with sufficient resources and numbers; a strong mandate to protect civilians, peacekeepers, and humanitarian workers; a clear U.N. command and control structure, and benchmarks with the threat of sanctions that hold the Sudanese Government accountable; no room for further stalling or delay by the Sudanese Government; a renewed diplomatic effort to bring about a long-term political settlement, including naming a Special Representative of the Secretary General to monitor implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement; and the force must be deployed as quickly as possible.

Congress, the administration, and the private sector—we all need to take action to end the genocide in Darfur. In Congress we have passed the Genocide Accountability Act, which allows the prosecution of genocide committed by anyone currently in the United States, regardless of where the genocide occurred. We have passed language in the Iraq supplemental bill that requires the Treasury Department to submit to Congress a report that lists the companies operating in the Sudanese natural resources industry, and requires the General Services Administration to report to Congress on whether the U.S. Government has an active contract with any of those companies.

Later today the House is expected to pass a bill that would support State and local divestment efforts, require companies to disclose Sudanese-related business activities, investigate whether the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board has invested funds in any of these companies operated in Sudan, and bar the U.S. Government from operating with any companies operating to benefit the Sudanese regime.

A few weeks ago, the Senate passed the International Emergency Economic Powers Enhancement Act, which increases civil and criminal penalties associated with violating American economic sanctions such as those against Sudan. I encourage our House counterparts to pass this bill as well.

I have introduced legislation similar to the bill the House is expected to pass today that would support State governments that decide to encourage public funds to divest from Sudan-related investments. That bill has strong bipartisan support, nearly a third of the Senate.

We tried to pass it, but someone in the Senate has put a hold on that bill.

They have decided we should not move quickly to try to divest and discourage genocide. I urge whatever Republican colleague on that side has put a hold on this bill to seriously stop and consider the impact of this political move. We need to make sure the House and the Senate are on record on a bipartisan basis, clearly, unequivocally.

I have also included in the Senate Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act language requiring the administration to report on the effectiveness of the current sanctions regime and recommended steps Congress can take.

Personally, some of us have decided to divest from Sudan-related investments in our own portfolios as a gesture of solidarity. The administration has taken some important steps. In April of this year, at the Holocaust Museum, President Bush declared rightly that the United States has a moral obligation to stop the genocide in Darfur. Recently the President took the first step toward meeting that obligation by ordering the U.S. sanctions against Sudan be tightened.

The Treasury Department is adding 30 companies that are owned or controlled by the Government of Sudan to a list of firms that are barred from U.S. financial assistance. The Office of Foreign Assets Control within the Treasury Department, working with other agencies, has worked hard to tighten economic and political sanctions.

Although these are important steps, I wish the U.S. Government, the Congress, and the President, had taken these steps sooner. Ultimately, we and the private sector must do all we can to ensure the genocide in Darfur once and for all is brought to an end.

I am going to end today with a quote from Nobel laureate and Holocaust survivor Eli Weisel:

Take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented.

I see on the floor my colleagues from Wisconsin and New Jersey who join me today in this floor effort, this message to the United Nations. I wish to thank Senator MENENDEZ for his continuing interest in this Darfur genocide. He has carried on in the Senate a tradition started when I first came here by his predecessor, Senator Corzine.

I also wish to thank Senator FEINGOLD, who is chairman of the African Subcommittee of Foreign Relations. He has a special interest in that continent and a special dedication to ending the genocide in Darfur.

I yield the floor.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague, Senator DURBIN, for bringing us together today to talk about the ongoing genocide in Darfur and, more specifically, the upcoming U.N. Security Council resolution and for his continuing efforts in the Senate.

I am also honored and pleased to be with Senator FEINGOLD, who has been

such an incredibly powerful voice on this issue, both in his position as the chairman of the African Subcommittee on Foreign Relations and in his principle position itself. I am honored to join with them in this effort.

Today, as we speak on the Senate floor, the U.N. Security Council is negotiating a new Darfur resolution. So today we are on the Senate floor to send a loud and clear message to the United Nations. The people of Darfur need a strong and meaningful resolution that puts into action the end of the genocide and ensures that a United Nations-African Union troop force gets into Darfur.

Today, we are here to add our voices to those who call for a U.N. resolution with strong authority, for a robust hybrid United Nations-African Union force, and a full mandate and speedy deployment. It has long been clear that the overstretched and underfunded African Union troops cannot end the genocide. If this new force is not allowed in, the carnage and the destruction we have witnessed now for over 4 years will continue.

We have known that a U.N. force is the key to ending the violence in Darfur, and we have tried in the past to put it into place. Over a year ago, when I first came to the Senate, I got the Senate to pass an amendment for \$60 million to fund the U.N. peacekeeping force in Darfur. I was joined by my colleagues in that effort.

Almost 1 year ago, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1706, which called for 22,500 U.N. troops and police officers to support the African Union force in Sudan. Yet we still see no hybrid force on the ground. We still hear of attacks on humanitarian workers, we still learn of atrocities against civilians.

The lives of these millions of displaced persons now hang in a delicate balance between life and death. If we were in the refugee camps being attacked, who among us would be content with the counsels of: patience, patience, and delay. Who?

Let's be frank; it has been the Government of Sudan that has kept this force from entering. Now they recently have agreed to allow a force in. Yet we have heard these words before. Words mean little without real action. That is why I am pleased this new U.N. Security Council will likely include the transfer of authority to a hybrid United Nations-African Union mission that will allow the use of force to ensure the security and movement of the mission's personnel and humanitarian workers.

But to be meaningful, this force must be deployed, and it must be deployed as quickly as humanly possible. I am disappointed, however, that after rounds of negotiations, the resolution was ultimately watered down. From what I understand, there will be no reference to sanctions, there will be no right to seize and dispose of illegal arms, there will be no reference to the jingaweit,

the brutal pro-Khartoum militia force responsible for many of the atrocities.

While I understand the need to negotiate a resolution that will pass, ultimately, we cannot let this manipulation continue. We cannot let Sudan's Ambassador have veto power over these lives. We cannot let nations with permanent seats and veto power on the Council continue to act irresponsibly. That is where I wish to close.

China says they generally approve, generally approve of the new resolution. They have been working, however, behind the scenes to weaken it. They reportedly helped remove references to sanctions. They reportedly objected to its "controversial tone" about genocide. Simply put, they continue to act in their own economic interest. We have seen them take some positive steps in the past, and it is positive that they are reportedly not going to block this resolution and that they may even support it.

But such a small step when China is under public international pressure is simply not enough. That is why I am pleased my resolution on China and Darfur passed the Senate last night. This resolution, which my colleagues on the floor supported, calls on China to use its unique influence and economic leverage to stop the genocide and violence in Darfur.

China has longstanding economic and military ties with Sudan, and they must use their economic leverage to do more than fill their wallet. As China prepares to host the 2008 Olympic Summer Games, we must hold the Chinese Government accountable to act consistently with the Olympic standard of preserving human dignity around the world, including in Darfur.

Once again, the international community finds itself with another opportunity to bring about real change in Darfur. The resolution being passed by the U.N. Security Council will only be meaningful if measures with teeth are included.

As John Prendergast, senior adviser to the International Crisis Group, said recently in testimony before Congress:

Barking without biting is the diplomatic equivalent of giving comfort to the enemy.

Time has run out for negotiations. Time has run out for the Khartoum Government to balk. Time has run out for watered down U.N. Security Council resolutions. We must get that hybrid force on the ground. We must end the genocide.

If "never again" is to have real meaning, if those words we use are to have real meaning, it has to have strong action to stop the genocide, strong action that history will judge as among the righteous, anything less will lend to our collective condemnation, and to the ever-nagging conscience that will not rest as others die.

That is the choice before the U.N. Security Council. I am glad those of us here are making our voices felt so, hopefully, the Council will act and we can have meaningful action to "never again."

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor today to raise the critical and timely issue of the U.N. Security Council's authorization of an expanded peacekeeping mission for the Darfur region of Sudan. Senator DURBIN has been a stalwart advocate for the people of Darfur for years and I admire and appreciate his dedication to keeping their plight at the top of Congress's agenda and to making sure we finally take strong action to help the more than 2 million displaced Darfuris who are languishing in squalid camps and punish those who continue to be responsible for their plight.

The United Nations Security Council is currently considering a resolution expected to authorize a robust peacekeeping mission to protect the innocent people of Darfur. This is of course a welcome, and overdue, effort. By now, there is little disagreement anywhere in the world that the current force of just over 7,000 courageous but underequipped and beleaguered African Union peacekeepers is not adequately protecting civilians or aid workers from attacks by rebels and government-sponsored militias, nor are they able to sufficiently safeguard humanitarian access to the tens of thousands whose survival now depends upon outside assistance. The AU force in Darfur has repeatedly been deprived of adequate resources and equipment, and yet despite this inconsistent support they have remained committed to the job. Support from the United Nations has been in theory forthcoming, for quite some time. In principle, the roadblocks have been many and the unfortunate result of this hobbled mission transition has been more violence, more displacement, and more death throughout Darfur.

The recent acceptance to expedite the transition of this mission to a more robust U.N.-AU mission is a step in the right direction, but we must bear in mind the number of agreements that have long since been overlooked, ignored, or flat-out rejected by the Sudanese Government.

And while a draft resolution being circulated indicates that the international community is actively moving forward to deploy this hybrid force, I am very disappointed that the resolution's cosponsors have succumbed to pressure from the Sudanese and deleted language which condemned the government for violations of past U.N. resolutions and peace agreements and removed the threat of sanctions in the event of continued noncompliance. The United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Zalmay Khalilzad suggests that the United States has been "flexible" and "open minded in terms of non-core issues" when negotiating this resolution, and I can only hope the administration will not show flexibility when firmness is required. I certainly understand the necessity of diplomatic compromise; however, I feel strongly that the draft resolution

being circulated in New York has been unacceptably weakened.

The amended resolution begins by "Recalling all its previous resolutions and presidential statements concerning the situation in Sudan." In fact, however, this new proposal steps back from nearly a dozen Security Council resolutions, dating back to July 2004. Those resolutions were not just addressing the "situation in Sudan"—they were expressing concern over the rising violence in Darfur and the role of the Sudanese Government in perpetuating the conflict. The distinction here is an important one and should not be overlooked.

The preamble goes on to detail the development and endorsement of the so-called Addis Ababa Agreement, which laid out the three-phased approach to an unprecedented joint United Nations-African Union "hybrid" peacekeeping mission. At that time—8 months ago—then-Secretary-General Kofi Annan seemed confident that troops would be mobilizing soon, and the U.S. administration promptly welcomed what it called "the successful outcome of this historic meeting."

What appears to have been forgotten in November, and again in the current U.N. debate, is that in August of 2006—just about a year ago—the Security Council passed Resolution 1706, which authorized up to 22,500 U.N. troops and police officers for a robust United Nations peacekeeping force with the power to use all necessary means to protect humanitarian aid workers and civilian populations, as well as to seize and dispose of illegal weapons. The new resolution currently being considered in New York does not reference Resolution 1706 or the Sudanese Government's defiant refusal to comply with its provisions. Nor does it draw the appropriate lessons from the failed attempt to deploy U.N. peacekeepers in Darfur almost a year ago.

Rather than include stronger monitoring and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that the Sudanese Government and other parties to the conflict abide by existing agreements and cooperate with the new peacekeeping mission, the resolution's cosponsors appear to have backed down to Sudanese pressure. Their weakened resolution omits a condemnation of Sudan for failing to ensure humanitarian aid reaches those in need, deletes reference to evidence of violations of the UNSC-mandated arms embargo—which many outside experts have noted has been repeatedly violated with little consequence—drops a request that the Secretary General immediately report any breach of this or previous resolutions and agreements, and removes a threat that the U.N. would take "further measures"—in other words, sanctions—in the event of noncompliance. How can we believe that individuals will be held accountable for their actions when we have seen such entrenched impunity?

In terms of the peacekeeping mission envisioned for Darfur, this new resolu-

tion is much less ambitious than Resolution 1706. The new "UNAMID" mission is referred to as an "operation," rather than a "force," and rather than giving peacekeepers the authority to "use all necessary means" to protect civilians and aid workers, the new resolution allows them only to "take all necessary action." These semantic distinctions reveal a worrisome retreat from the robust, capable mission authorized in Resolution 1706. And yet, the Sudanese Government has criticized even this diluted resolution. As I said before, diplomatic compromise is important, but not as important as making sure we finally have the tools to punish and put a stop to atrocities.

Sudan's obstruction of this most recent international effort to end the genocide in Darfur should not surprise anyone. After all, this is the same regime we saw attack its own citizens in indiscriminate bombing raids and obstruct humanitarian access during 2 decades of bloody civil war with southern Sudan. These same tactics are being used today in Darfur.

Last week, in its first overall review of Sudan's record for more than a decade, the U.N.'s independent Human Rights Committee said that "widespread and systematic serious human rights violations—including murder, rape, forced displacement and attacks against the civil population—have been and continue to be committed with total impunity throughout Sudan and particularly in Darfur." The only thing more disturbing than the Sudanese Government's practice of organized atrocities as a method of governance is the inability of the international community so far to put a stop to these crimes and secure justice for the victims.

How many more families must be displaced? How many more innocent lives lost? How many more U.N. resolutions, presidential statements, political speeches, and public rallies will be needed? How much evidence of calculated persecution will it take before the international community stands up to the Sudanese Government and the rebels, brings them to the negotiating table, and deploys an expanded peacekeeping mission to protect civilians and ultimately, help secure the peace, in a region that for too long has received much attention but little action?

Although the revised resolution omits the original reference to Chad and the Central African Republic, it does express "concern that the ongoing violence in Darfur might further negatively affect the rest of Sudan as well as the region." The short- and long-term impacts of the crisis in Darfur are real, far-reaching, and very troubling. The humanitarian consequences will require massive logical coordination and rehabilitation assistance. Economically, the rebuilding of infrastructure and livelihoods will demand additional resources and technical support. And this will be required not just for

Darfur but for the whole of Sudan, as well as the broader region.

If this U.N. resolution is passed as it currently stands, we can expect the Sudanese Government to try to evade its requirements and agreements without a single consequence. Should that happen, the toll of the genocide in Darfur will continue to mount—in lives lost, in persons displaced, and in fundamental human values that the international community has failed to uphold.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. How much time remains in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. One minute on the Democratic side and 1 minute on the Republican side.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield back the remaining time on our side and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of H.R. 976, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 976) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2530

Mr. BAUCUS. I call up my amendment at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 2530.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the Senate now has before it the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, otherwise known as CHIP. Pending is a substitute amendment that reflects the bill reported by the

Finance Committee by a vote of 17 to 4, a strong bipartisan vote.

The bipartisan package Finance Committee colleagues and I crafted will give millions more American children the healthy start they need to lead a long, productive life.

Behind me is a photo of Abigale. Who is Abigale? Abigale is from Missoula, MT. At the time the photo was taken she was 4 years old. Abigale has two siblings, and they live with their mother and father. All three of the children participate in the Montana Children's Health Insurance Program. When Abigale was 2½ years old, she fell down, split her head open and had to have nine stitches. Her medical care was covered by the Children's Health Insurance Program. That same year her 6-year-old brother broke his arm twice and CHIP paid for the surgery, the hospital stay, and all of the medical care he received.

Fawn, Abigale's mother, is thankful to have CHIP not only for the emergency care it provides but also it helps immunize children against childhood diseases and allows them to get the checkups they need for school each year.

Not having health insurance clearly affects a child's life. Uninsured kids do not go to the doctor. They do not have checkups. They remain undiagnosed for serious childhood conditions such as asthma and diabetes. They do not have vaccinations, and they put themselves and their schoolmates at risk for serious illnesses. Kids without health insurance do not have eye exams and are less likely to get glasses, and often cannot see the chalkboard at school. They are not diagnosed with learning disabilities, and they struggle through their classes. Kids who do not have insurance do not see the dentist. They do not get their cavities filled. They do not get braces, and they risk serious illness due to poor dental health. Adequate health care creates a critical foundation for a healthy life.

No one wants innocent children to suffer. Investing in children's health is the compassionate choice, but it is more than that. Insuring our children is a smart economic investment in our Nation's future. Why? Because it is the only choice, if we wish to imbue future generations with strong minds and healthy bodies. It is quite simple. Health insurance has a direct effect on a child's performance at school. Healthy children are more likely to go to school, and they are more likely to do well in school. Then they are more likely to become productive members of the workforce.

Children with health insurance are less likely to receive expensive emergency room care. Parents of children with health insurance are less likely to miss days at work to care for their sick children. When America insures our children, we are all better off, we all benefit.

Health insurance is especially important to the success of minority popu-

lations. African-American, Hispanic, and Native American children are all less likely to have health insurance. They are more likely to be poor. Providing affordable coverage is one of the best ways to reduce the gap for these kids.

CHIP has already helped to narrow racial and ethnic disparities in access to care among low-income children. But we can do better. We can continue to narrow that gap.

Health insurance is also a key ingredient to alleviating child poverty. Low-income families without insurance often get stuck in a bitter cycle of medical debt. Parents struggling to make ends meet should not have to choose between buying asthma inhalers for their children and putting dinner on the table.

So I hope my fellow Senators will make the right choice, the only choice. I hope they will join me in making our children's future, and America's future, a brighter one.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this debate is not just about extending health care to our children. It is about our national priorities. It is about who we are as a nation. It is about which side we are on.

For the last 6 years, we have had a President who has insisted, as one of his major priorities, on more and more tax breaks for the very wealthiest people in our country. People who are worth millions of dollars and people who are worth billions of dollars have, collectively, received hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks. But when it comes to those people most in need, those people who are most vulnerable, including the children of our country—the kids who are 2 or 3 years of age—who have health care needs, this President, tragically and embarrassingly, has not been there. If you are wealthy and powerful, he is there. If you are a child and vulnerable, AWOL—he is not listening. In fact, he has been in opposition.

It is no secret to the American people that our current health care system is disintegrating. Today, 46 million Americans, including over 9 million children, have no health insurance whatsoever, and tens of millions more are underinsured, with high premiums and copayments. Costs are soaring every single year, and small businesses in my State of Vermont and throughout this country are no longer, in many cases, able to offer any health insurance. Throughout the country today workers are being asked to pay a higher and higher percentage of the cost of their health insurance, and many of them cannot afford to do that because health insurance premiums have been rising four times faster than workers' earnings since the year 2000.

In the midst of all of that—more and more uninsured, costs soaring—we end up spending twice as much per capita